

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative, Jennifer Ying, during the telephone conference of December 21, 2006. During the conference, Applicants noted that, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the claim language "about a common axis" is commonly understood in the art to mean the same axis.

### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-8 and 10-15 are pending.

Claim 5 has been amended to depend from claim 1.

No new matter has been added.

### Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings, contending that the feature of “a hole” recited in claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 has not been illustrated. Applicants respectfully traverse the objection.

Claims 3, 4, 7, and 8 recite “said drive shaft rotatably engages a hole formed on an end of said crankshaft in order to support another end of the drive shaft.” Applicants submit herewith, in **Attachment A**, a copy of Figure 2. In the copy of Figure 2 in Attachment A, Applicants have noted where the hole recited in claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 is illustrated. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the drawings illustrate each and every feature recited in the claims.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1, 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

With respect to the features of a common axis recited in claims 1 and 12, the Examiner contends that the phrase “about a common axis” is unclear. The Examiner states that the phrase “is interpret [sic] as not on the same axis, therefore they are [sic] must be in parallel axes which is the same situation as in the cited reference.” (Detailed Action, page 8, Item 7, lines 4-5.)

As discussed in the December 21<sup>st</sup> telephone conference, Applicants note that the term “about a common axis” is well-understood to mean that the two entities will rotate around the same axis. Furthermore, as discussed in the December 21<sup>st</sup> telephone conference, Applicants note that the drive shaft 6 and the crankshaft 12 are illustrated as being positioned on a common axis in Figure 2. Applicants further noted that the claim language does **not** recite that the drive shaft and crankshaft are concentric with each other. Therefore, while the illustration in Figure 2 does not depict the drive shaft 6 and the crankshaft 12 as being perfectly aligned with each other about a vertical line, this does not imply that the two shafts 6, 12 cannot rotate about the same axis.

With respect to the features of a vertical plane recited in claims 12 and 13, the Examiner contends that the phrase “the vertical plane intersects” is vague, since a plurality of vertical planes can exist.

As discussed in the December 21<sup>st</sup> telephone conference, in the claimed invention, the gears 8, 8 are symmetric about the vertical plane, and thus, the vertical plane must be located equidistant



